

Interview Summary	Applicati n No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/280,791		QIN ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Christopher C Pratt		1771	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Christopher C Pratt.
(3)_____.
- (2) James Withers.
(4)_____.

Date of Interview: 21 March 2003 .

Type: a)☒ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference
c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____ .

Claim(s) discussed: All generally .

Identification of prior art discussed: Honeycutt (5207873 and 5885907), Yamamura et al (5882780), Chen et al (5990377) .

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached. g)☐ was not reached. h)☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argued that the spunlaced limitation was different than the hydroentangling taught by Honeycutt; however, needed to consult with the inventors to determine the details of those differences. Until applicant can show differences, it is the examiners position that the two processes are equivalent. Applicant argued that the claimed invention possesses a bursting strength not present in Honeycutt, but also needed to consult with the inventors to determine why the instant invention possesses an increased bursting strength. Until evidence is provided, it is the examiner's position that the bursting strength of Honeycutt is equivalent to applicant's claimed bursting strength because both inventions are created from the same materials, by the same process.